REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. No claims have been amended or cancelled. Claims 1-21 are currently pending.

Claims 1-13, 15-16, and 18-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,330,976 to Dymetman et al. ("Dymetman"). Dymetman describes a system in which a user may access electronic documents, and cause actions to be performed at a local or remote device connected to a network, by interacting with hardcopy documents using a pointer.

Regarding independent claim 1, the it is asserted in the Office Action that the pointer 502, the camera 802, and the document 2 of Dymetman teach the features of the "electronic reading device", the "sensor" and the "formatted surface" of independent claim 1, respectively. It is further asserted in the Office Action that the display 4 of Dymetman teaches the features of the "separate electronic device that includes a display" of independent claim 1. The Office Action cites column 29, lines 1 to column 30, line 7 and column 35, lines 1-19 of Dymetman as teaching "wherein at least a portion of the address pattern (2) identifies a specific application (i.e., socket); and wherein the separate electronic device (i.e. peripheral 4) is adapted to request an application description corresponding to the specific application from an application server (i.e., network), and retrieve the application description (i.e., socket name) corresponding to the specific application from the server." The cited portions of Dymetman describe the use of a pointer to select content from a printed page and make the content available as input to an action or application, such as for translating a word on a printed page. The cited portions of Dymetman further describe an isomorphism between a physical page and a digital page in which selection of an entity on the physical page by positioning a pointer is coupled with selection of the counterpart entity in the digital page.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in the cited portion of Dymetman of the feature of independent claim 1 of a separate electronic device that includes a display screen that is adapted to request an application description corresponding to a specific application from an application server, and retrieve the application description corresponding to the specific application from the application server. The Office Action appears to equate the "socket name" of Dymetman with the "application description" of independent

7

claim 1. Column 24, line 65 to column 25, line 7 of Dymetman describes that when a digital page launches an application with which it may have continuing interaction, it maintains a connection with the application, such as a socket connection. Dymetman further describes that the digital page may launch an application on a user's peripheral device via an output player. A socket name is described by Dymetman as information that is returned by the output player to the digital page that is needed to establish a direct connection with the application. Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in Dymetman that the socket name consists of or includes an application description.

Additionally, as previously discussed, the Office Action asserts that the display 4 of Dymetman teaches the "separate electronic device that includes a display screen" of independent claim 1. The display 4 is described by Dymetman as a peripheral device that functions to present output from a digital page 6 stored on a server that is related to a document 2. Dymetman further describes that the display 4 may have an associated network address. Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion that the display 4 of Dymetman is adapted to request an application description corresponding to a specific application from an application server, and retrieve the application description corresponding to the specific application from the application server. In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 distinguishes over Dymetman and requests that that the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of independent claim 1 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 15 includes the feature of "wherein the electronic display device is adapted to request an application description corresponding to the specific application from an application server, and retrieve the application description corresponding to the specific application from the application server." For similar reasons as those discussed with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 15 also distinguishes over Dymetman and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of independent claim 15 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-13 and 16-21 are dependent upon and include the features of independent claims 1 and 15, respectively. For at least the reasons as discussed with respect to independent claims 1 and 15, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-13 and 16-21 also distinguish over

Dymetman and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejections of claims 2-13 and 16-21 be withdrawn.

Claims 14 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dymetman. Claims 14 and 17 are dependent upon and include the features of independent claims 1 and 15, respectively. For at least the reasons as discussed with respect to independent claims 1 and 15, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 14 and 17 also distinguish over Dymetman and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections of claims 14 and 17 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: February 16, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By _Michael W. Maddox_

Michael W. Maddox
　Registration No.: 47,764
JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL
　CORPORATION
1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200
Dallas, Texas 75202
(214) 855-4500
Attorneys For Applicant